

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

IN RE KAMAL ROY, *pro se*

-----X

:
:
:
:
:
:

SUMMARY ORDER

08-CV-1257 (DLI)(LB)

DORA L. IRIZARRY, U.S. District Judge:

Pro se plaintiff Kamal Roy, a frequent filer in this and other jurisdictions,¹ filed a new civil action on March 21, 2008. By Order dated April 10, 2008, the court dismissed the action for failure to conform with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and because the action is frivolous. The court again warned Mr. Roy that it would not tolerate the future filing of frivolous actions. Plaintiff was directed to show cause within 30 days why the court should not issue an order barring him from filing any future *in forma pauperis* action without first obtaining leave of the court.

On April 24, 2008, the court received another lengthy document, bound with white thread and covered with coffee-colored stains. Like his previous filings, the submission is entirely incomprehensible. Although it does not bear the assigned docket number, the court construes this filing as plaintiff's response to the April 10, 2008 Order, as it is dated April 18, 2008 and incorporates copies of several of the scrawled and photocopied pages that appeared in the March 21, 2008 filing. This response fails to offer any cause for permitting future filing, and, indeed, confirms

¹ Plaintiff's previous cases in this court are: *Roy v. State of New York*, No. 07-CV-0340 (DLI), 2007 WL 602303 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 20, 2007); *Roy v. We the People*, No. 07-CV-2930 (DLI), *Roy v. We the People*, No. 07-CV-3420 (DLI), *Roy v. Gramlegeek-Blog*, No. 07-CV-4889 (DLI), 2007 WL 4299177 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 5, 2007); and *In re Roy*, No. 08-CV-0388 (DLI). Moreover, plaintiff has filed frequently in other jurisdictions and has been barred in some of them. See *Roy v. United States*, No. 06-685-SLR, 2007 WL 1109296, at *1 (D.Del. April 11, 2007, as amended April 24, 2007) (collecting cases from that and other courts.); *Kamal Karna Roy a/k/a/ Jungle Democracy v. CBS Inc., et al*, No. 07-206-SLR (D.Del. May 4, 2007) (permanently enjoining future filings after finding sharp, two-inch needles stuck into papers).

the court's impression that plaintiff is unwilling or unable to comply with the procedural requirements of a civil action as delineated in Rule 8.

“If a litigant has a history of filing vexatious, harassing or duplicative lawsuits, courts may impose sanctions, including restrictions on future access to the judicial system.” *Hong Mai Sa v. Doe*, 406 F.3d 155, 158 (2d Cir. 2005) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that (1) Mr. Roy is enjoined from filing any new *in forma pauperis* action in the District Court for the Eastern District of New York without first obtaining leave of this court; and (2) the Clerk of Court is directed to return to Mr. Roy, without filing, any action that is received without an application seeking leave to file. 28 U.S.C. § 1651. Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit Mr. Roy from filing an appeal of this Order. The court, however, certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
May 13, 2008

/s/

DORA L. IRIZARRY
United States District Judge